1 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION,	
Plaintiff,	Case No. 2:15-cv-02366-JCM-GWF
vs.	ORDER
CLARENCE MOSES WILLIS, et al.,	
Defendants.	
	_

This matter is before the Court on Defendant Ernest Aldridge's ("Defendant") Specific Motion for an Order to Compel Disclosure (#68), filed on May 16, 2016.

Defendant's motion seeks "an order to compel counsel for Plaintiff to complete disclosure of pertinent information lacking in the cover sheet and in the initial and subsequent pleadings."

Motion to Compel (#68), pg. 1. Defendant asserts that he does not know who is moving against him, what Plaintiff's legal character, standing, and capacity are, the legal relationship between Plaintiff and Defendant, the authorization for counsel to represent Plaintiff, and whether Plaintiff has authority to conduct business in Nevada. See id. at pgs. 2-4. However, Defendant has filed the instant motion without an attempt to resolve these issues with Plaintiff's counsel. The meet and confer requirements in Rule 37(a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule ("LR") 26-7(b) require the moving party to confer or attempt to confer in person, or at least by telephone, with the opposing party in a good faith effort to resolve the discovery dispute prior to filing a motion to compel. Shuffle Master v. Progressive Games, 170 F.R.D. 166, 171 (D.Nev. 1996); Walker v. North Las Vegas Police Depart., 2016 WL 427063, *2 (D.Nev. Feb. 3, 2016). The moving party is also required to include a certification setting forth its efforts and the results of the meet-and-confer attempts. Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(1); LR 26-7(c).

Case 2:15-cv-02366-JCM-GWF Document 72 Filed 05/31/16 Page 2 of 2

In addition to Defendant's failure to comply with the meet and confer requirements, Defendant's motion, on its face, does not appear to have merit. Plaintiff's Amended Complaint identifies Plaintiff as "a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the United States with its principal place of business in Washington, D.C." Amended Complaint (#41), pg. 1, ¶ 1. The Amended Complaint also sets forth, with sufficient specificity, Plaintiff's relationship to Defendant and the facts and circumstances surrounding Plaintiff's claims against each Defendant. See id. at pgs. 5-16. Furthermore, Plaintiff's counsel is not required to present an authorization that it has been retained to represent Plaintiff in this action and it is appropriate for Plaintiff's counsel to sign any pleadings on Plaintiff's behalf that are filed in this matter. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 11. For these reasons, Defendant's motion to compel must be denied. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant Ernest Aldridge's Specific Motion for an Order to Compel Disclosure (#68) is **denied**. DATED this 31st day of May, 2016. United States Magistrate Judge